

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to resolve issues raised by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Entry of the above amendment is respectfully requested.

Election of Species Requirement

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 4, 5 and 10 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species.

In response, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 4, 5 and 10 be rejoined upon a finding of allowable subject matter in generic claim 1.

Drawings

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a), because the carousel must be shown in a drawing or canceled from the claims.

In response, and to advance the prosecution, Applicant has deleted the carousel feature from the claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the drawing objection has been overcome, and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

In response, Applicant has amended the claims to resolve issues raised by the Examiner. Further, Applicant submits that the bearing, roller, and forces recitations in claim 1 provide antecedent basis for the subsequent recitation of those features in dependent claims. Similarly, the first end and second end recitations in claim 2 provide antecedent basis for the subsequent recitation of those features in claim 3, which depends on claim 2.

Thus, Applicant submits that the amended claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. If the Examiner still considers there to be issues in this regard, though, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned to resolve these issues in a mutually acceptable manner.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Also, the Examiner indicates that claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. Based on the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph has been overcome, and thus the present claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 23, 2010

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725